

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD  
ON SEPTEMBER 10, 1976, IN  
CONFERENCE ROOM #202, SECOND  
FLOOR, UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

1 President Elliott called the meeting to order at 2:19 p.m.

Present: President Elliott, Provost Bright, Registrar Gebhardtshauer, Parliamentarian Schwartz, Adams, Amling, Birnbaum, Cottrell, Davison, C. Elliott, Ferster, Ginsburg, Griffith, Jones, Kirsch, Kurtz, Kyriakopoulos, Morgan, Pierpont, Reesing, Rockoff, Schiff, Schmidt, Smith, Solomon, Stevenson, and Wood.

Absent: Cassidy, Fox, Kramer, Liebowitz, Linton, Plotz, Sapin, Snodgrass, Tillman, Vaill, and Vontress.

2 The President called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the regular meeting of the Faculty Senate on May 7, 1976. Professor Morgan said he would like to read into the record the following comment concerning the minutes received from an immediate past member of the Senate:

August, 1976

Faculty Senate Secretary:

Because I was a participant in the May 7, 1976 meeting of the Faculty Senate, but will not be present at the September meeting when the call for corrections, changes or approval of the minutes of the May meeting is made, I wish to make it known by these presents to all men and women that insofar as my participation in the May meeting is concerned, the minutes distributed do faithfully, accurately, and truthfully record for posterity my participation in said meeting; hence, no corrections for my part.

The ghost of Senates past,

/s/ C. R. Naeser

There were no requests for corrections or changes, and the minutes were approved.

3 (a) With regard to the status of the case of Lee S. Bielski, Associate Professor, Department of Speech and Drama, Professor Morgan, on behalf of the Executive Committee, reported that in response to the Special Committee's report dated May 14, 1976, advising that it was not able to effect conciliation of Professor Bielski's grievance and therefore recommending institution of formal proceedings, the Executive Committee referred the matter to the Professional

Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee. He then called upon Professor Reesing, Chairman of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, to bring the Senate up to date on this matter. Professor Reesing said that, as a consequence of the Special Committee's report referred to by Professor Morgan, the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee had moved through the sequence of procedures specified by the Faculty Code and anticipated that at a fairly early date the Committee would begin its formal hearings on the case.

(b) Reporting on the status of the revisions to the Faculty Code adopted by the Senate May 7, 1976, Professor Morgan, on behalf of the Executive Committee, read the following memorandum:

MEMORANDUM

June 9, 1976

TO: Dr. Lloyd H. Elliott, President

FROM: John A. Morgan, Jr., Chairman  
Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate

As you know, after three long years, the Faculty Senate completed its deliberations on revisions to the Code and Ordinances governing the academic personnel at the May 7, 1976, meeting. Attached is the revised document in completed form which the Faculty Senate, on behalf of the faculties of the University, recommends for adoption by the Board of Trustees. We hope that the necessary action by the Board will occur as soon as possible for, as I am sure you will agree, some of the changes need to be put into effect promptly.

May I express both for myself and my colleagues our thanks for your critical and helpful participation in the revision process. Both the objections and suggestions offered by you and your administrative colleagues served to inform our deliberations and to improve the finished product.

JAMjr/dt  
Attachment

Professor Morgan said that someone asked at the Faculty Assembly meeting whether the Board of Trustees would act on these revisions at its October meeting and at that time the President responded and perhaps he would like to make a similar comment now for the information of those persons who were not present at the Assembly meeting. President Elliott advised the Senate that the Board had elected to consider the Code Revision by appointing an ad hoc committee which was studying the revision and will report its recommendations to the full Board at its October meeting. He said that he was in full agreement with Professor Morgan in believing that there were sections of the new Code the prompt implementation of which were in the best interests of the University, and that he was hopeful that action on the Code would be accomplished at the October Board meeting. However, the President added that neither the time schedules for Board committees nor for faculty committees could be prognosticated with very much accuracy, but that he would do his best.

Professor Davison asked if the procedures under which Professor Reesing's committee ~~were~~ operating in the Bielski case would be affected if the Board didn't accept

Correction  
10/8/76

the revisions in October. Professor Morgan replied that he thought whatever action the Board takes on the Code in October would have no effect on the case presently before the committee because - it seemed to him - if a complaint is lodged under an existing situation, then the grievant is entitled to the procedures then existing. Further discussion followed by Professors Davison and Morgan.

(c) With reference to the newly-revised Faculty Organization Plan which was just published and distributed to the faculty in August, Professor Morgan, on behalf of the Executive Committee, advised the members that in accordance with Article IV, Sections 2 and 3, of the Plan, it was time to begin the four-year review again. In order to constitute the 1976 Review Committee for the Faculty Organization Plan, Professor Morgan said that a memorandum dated September 7, 1976, was mailed to the deans requesting that election of two representatives from their respective faculties be held for the purpose.

Prof. Morgan said that he wished to point out a few things with regard to the new Faculty Organization Plan. First, he said that the by-laws of the Faculty Senate are printed as an appendix to the Plan, which makes no sense to him. But the by-laws are not considered, and properly so, for review by the Review Committee; thus, any changing or up-dating in the by-laws becomes the task of the Chairman of the Executive Committee and the Senate Office staff. He said one error in the by-laws *Correction* *10/8/76* which was not corrected either in the most recent printing ~~nor~~ in the 1970 printing concerned observers' attendance at Senate meetings. He said that by resolution adopted by the Senate in 1968 Senate meetings were opened to all members of the University community, not just members of the Faculty Assembly, unless the Senate was in Executive Session. Professor Morgan said he just wanted to emphasize that since the by-laws of the Faculty Senate were amendable by a simple resolution, we should be careful about changing the by-laws without identifying the action as a change in the by-laws. With further reference to the by-laws, Professor Morgan said that the Executive Committee has asked the Chairmen of the Senate Standing Committees to undertake an evaluation of the roles of their committees because some reconsideration of the Senate committee structure also was clearly in order. He reminded the members that the evaluation reports were due not later than October 22nd.

Professor Griffith asked Professor Morgan if the Executive Committee contemplated appointing a committee to study the by-laws and the committee structure, and, if so, whether a study would be made of the present Senate terms because it seemed to him that the awkwardness of the Senate sessions curtailed the effectiveness of the committees' work. Professor Morgan responded that he thought the present Senate term was provided for in the Faculty Organization Plan itself, and, if that was correct, then it would be important to advise the Review Committee of the Senate's view on this matter. He said he thought the Executive Committee did contemplate appointing a special committee to consider the organization of the Senate and it would be appropriate to give this committee a little broader charge.

4

Under Brief Statements Professor Stevenson said that he would like to inquire about the plans for the area now occupied by the F Street Club and some other buildings, since this problem was one that was of some concern to him, partly because the University seemed to be getting bad press about it and partly because of what he personally felt were some rather poor architectural decisions that have been made by the University in the last few years, a view which he thought was shared by a number of his colleagues, and a situation in which he thought the Faculty Senate might see its interests involved. He asked the President if he could give the Senate a report on the status of that particular piece of property and the plans for it, particularly the status of the hiring of an architect. President Elliott responded that the University was repre-



sented by Mr. Diehl and the architect who was employed to develop it, and they were presently negotiating with the Fine Arts Commission to see if a compromise could be agreed upon. Professor Stevenson said that he realized these were complex aesthetic and economic matters, but he wondered if the President could sketch briefly the nature of the compromise which was being sought. The President said that the Fine Arts Commission had suggested about three different approaches to the resolution of the problem, and that the architect had come in with at least three approaches, and that they were trying to resolve the issue in such a way as to be acceptable to both parties. Professor Stevenson asked if the Koubek firm was the architect for the University, and the President responded in the affirmative. Professor Stevenson said that, while he had no particular bone to pick with the Koubek firm, he was married to an architect and thus had been exposed to matters architectural. He said it appeared to him from comments from architect friends and from his wife that the Koubek firm was not particularly noted for its excellence in historic preservation; in fact, it was more noted for producing speculative office buildings of the type that now line both sides of "K" Street, whereas there were several other architectural firms which have a reputation of being able to preserve the character of a neighborhood and still produce an economically viable building. Professor Stevenson said that he didn't mean to suggest that it was within the sphere of his knowledge to say that the Koubek firm was not competent to do that, but he would hope that the University was bearing the architect's reputation and abilities in mind. President Elliott replied that there were two consultants working with the architect - one from Seattle and one from Connecticut - whose reputation for this sort of thing was favorable; however, the President said, not being an architect, he was still subjected, as was Professor Stevenson, to a great deal of advice on the matter. The President said that if anyone in the Senate felt this was a matter upon which the Committee on Physical Facilities and he, Mr. Diehl, or others should confer, he would be happy to cooperate.

*corrected  
10/8/76*  
Professor Wood said he wished to comment upon a problem concerning communication which he has and which was probably shared by other members. He said he noted at the top of the agenda for the Senate meeting the date, time, and place of meeting. An ~~asterisk~~ <sup>asterisk</sup> appeared following the place of meeting with an explanation at the bottom of the agenda - "Please note change of meeting place for September only," which was in the University Library instead of the usual meeting place in Lisner Hall. Professor Wood said that he didn't note the change of meeting place and, so, as customary, he went to the old meeting place in Lisner Hall where he found a number of his distinguished colleagues assembled. Professor Wood said his question was - "How do you tell people when things change?" President Elliott said he was one whom Professor Wood found in Lisner Hall, and Professor Davison asked if Professor Wood had a literacy program he could suggest. Professor Wood replied that he was waiting for one to join. Professor Morgan said that he had had the utmost confidence in the effectiveness of the communication by noting on his calendar that the Senate meeting scheduled to begin at 2:10 p.m. on September 10th would begin at 2:20 p.m.

Professor Kyriakopoulos said he would like to know if the computerized system for processing grades was really very fast because he noted that the grades for the summer sessions had not yet been received. President Elliott said that he was advised that the summer grades would be run from the Computer Center within a week.

Professor Morgan said he had two brief remarks: first, the Senate has a new office located in Room #411, 4th Floor, Rice Hall, having moved from its old location in the Registrar's Office; and, secondly, the October Senate meeting would be held at its usual meeting place, back in Lisner Hall, 6th Floor, Faculty Conference Room.

Professor Kirsch asked if members could be informed as to the enrollment this semester. President Elliott responded that he had been informed yesterday that enrollment across the board at the University was just as predicted; that undergraduate enrollment was up, graduate enrollment was about level, and all housing units were filled.

Professor Griffith, on behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, said he would like to make the following brief report concerning the Committee's evaluation and review of the new short three-week summer session:

The Educational Policy Committee of the Senate took considerable interest in the plans of the Dean of the Summer Sessions last year to introduce the new short three-week session this past summer. But by the time the committee became informed of the details of the plans, the planning cycle was so far advanced that it seemed the reasonable thing to do was to focus on the evaluation and review of the session as it was actually run. The committee met with Deans Long and Paratore during the summer and went over fairly carefully the evaluation procedure that was to be used, the questionnaire that was distributed both to faculty and the students attending that three-week session in advance of its distribution to make sure that the kinds of questions we thought should be asked to determine the educational value of that experience were asked. We got very good cooperation from the deans and we then subsequently met in August with the two deans after they had received the forms and analyzed the data and we went over that rather carefully to try to assess whether or not the three-week session which seemed to prove economically sound was also educationally sound.

It was the conclusion of the committee, together with the deans, that the experiment probably required at least one more run in order to try to assess it more clearly. The problem is partly that in assessing the responses that were made it is difficult to say for example what proportion of grievances in any given educational session would constitute a norm because we don't have that data for the regular sessions; although I think something like 24% of the students were in one way or another unhappy with that three-week session, we don't know what the norm would be for a regular semester or for a five-week session. It did appear to the committee from the information that was gathered that both the faculty and the students who were involved estimated fairly highly the educational value of the experience. We were concerned for example whether or not there would be some diminishing use of the library, diminishing use of outside assignments, and various kinds of things that would just get crowded out because of the shortness of the session. It turned out that that expectation was correct; those things did tend to get crowded out a bit by virtue of the three-week session, but somewhat to our surprise, it seems that people who taught in that session felt that given the peculiar structure of it there were a good many things that could be achieved in that sort of session which couldn't be achieved in a somewhat longer, less intense session. Both the students and faculty were reasonably positive, at least positive enough to indicate that it should be tried for another time.

The session may be modified slightly since the deans and the committee agreed that it would seem appropriate from every point of view to allow at least one day between the end of classes and the examination period. Another problem that the committee was somewhat concerned about was the possibility of a student taking 6 credit hours in that three-week session and whether those students had different types of responses as opposed to students taking 3 credit hours. In this regard the committee asked that the deans permit that 6 hours be taken rather by exception by some sort of special petition in order to try to get more information on those students taking 6 credit hours during the three-week session.

I would like to end the report by saying that it seemed to me that this was an example of a situation in which the faculty and the administrative officers responsible were able to work quite closely and profitably together in assessing an educational program and trying to determine whether or not it was sound and worth doing. The results at which the committee arrived were not such that it seemed to justify bringing a resolution to the Senate, but I thought the Senate should be informed of this consideration.

- 5      There being no further business, the President, upon motion made and seconded, adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.



Robert Gebhardtsbauer  
Secretary

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

September 3, 1976

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, September 10, 1976, at 2:10 p.m., in Conference Room #202 on the second floor of the University Library.\*

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of the regular meeting of May 7, 1976
3. General Business:
  - (a) Report on the status of the case of Lee S. Bielski, Associate Professor, Department of Speech and Drama (Special Committee's Report attached)
  - (b) Report on the status of the Faculty Code adopted by the Faculty Senate May 7, 1976
  - (c) 1976 Review and Reappraisal of the Faculty Organization Plan in accordance with Article IV, Sections 2 and 3, of the Faculty Organization Plan, pp. 7-8
4. Brief Statements
5. Adjournment



Robert Gebhardtsbauer  
Secretary

\*Please note change of meeting place for September only.



THE  
GEORGE  
WASHINGTON  
UNIVERSITY

Washington, D.C. 20052 / Department of Psychology / (202) 676-6320

May 14, 1976

Professor John A. Morgan, Jr.  
Chairman, Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate  
The George Washington University  
Washington, D.C. 20052

Dear Professor Morgan:

Re: Special Committee in the Case of Lee S. Bielski,  
Associate Professor, Department of Speech and Drama

In the opinion of the Special Committee (Professor Eva M. Johnson, Professor Elyce Z. Ferster, and Professor Edwin J.B. Lewis) in the Lee S. Bielski case, the Committee has not been able to effect conciliation of Professor Bielski's grievance.

Two members of the Special Committee believe that formal proceedings to consider the matter should be instituted. One other member dissents from this recommendation.

Most sincerely,

*Eva M. Johnson*  
Eva M. Johnson  
Chairman